

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/299,562		HEGEDUS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Sandra Wegert		1647	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sandra Wegert.

(3) Gary Kunz.

(2) Elizabeth Kemmerer.

(4) Siu Lo 5) Pat Bird.

Date of Interview: 02 January 2003 .

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_ .

Claim(s) discussed: proposed 95-130 .

Identification of prior art discussed: No .

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed scope of the claims including: 1) claimed use of plasma proteins in addition to albumin; 2) therapeutics claimed in addition to those tested experimentally; 3) the use of trademark names in claims; 4) the use of product-by-process language in the claims to differentiate methods from those in the art. A clause at the end of independent claims that specified the method steps would distinguish the claims from the prior art. In addition, negative limitations such as "a solution... in which organic solvents have been removed" for example would also help distinguish the claims .